

RECEIVED
CENTRAL FAX CENTERREMARKS

JAN 29 2007

The Applicants request reconsideration of the rejection.

Claims 1-4, 6-10 and 12-15 remain pending.

In paragraph 4 of the Office Action, the Examiner indicated that the documents cited in the Information Disclosure Statement submitted on April 22, 2004 have not been considered because a legible copy and translation of each foreign patent were not included. Applicants submit that the copies were, indeed, legible and that no translation of JP 6-044129 and JP 5-028053 references is required because a concise explanation of the relevance of each of these documents is provided in the Background of the Invention section of the present application, particularly in the passage from page 1, line 15 through page 2, line 9. Providing a concise explanation of the relevance of a reference in the specification itself is permitted under 37 CFR §1.98(a)(3)(i). Therefore, the Examiner is respectfully requested to consider these documents and indicate consideration thereof in the forthcoming Office Action. However, in order to expedite prosecution of the present application, Applicants are submitting herewith a copy of the Form PTO-1449 having listed therein JP 6-044129 and JP 5-028053 and English language abstracts thereof so that the Examiner can indicate consideration of these references. An indication that these references have been considered by the Examiner is respectfully requested.

Claims 1-12 stand rejected under 35 USC §112, second paragraph as being indefinite for failing to particularly point out and distinctly claim the subject matter which Applicants regard as their invention. Various amendments were made

throughout claims 1-12 to bring them into conformity with the requirements of 35 USC §112, second paragraph.

Claims 7-12 stand rejected under 35 U.S.C. §101 as being directed to non-statutory subject matter. These claims have been amended to address the Examiner's concern.

Claims 1-2, 7-8 and 13-14 were rejected under 35 U.S.C. §103(a) as being unpatentable over the Applicants' admitted prior art (AAPA) in view of Hardin et al., U.S. Patent Publication No. 2002/0161961 (Hardin). The Applicants traverse as follows.

Hardin discloses a system that concurrently runs a plurality of independent virtual machines. Hardin allows a JAVA virtual machine to function as a language system independently of the other virtual machines. Hardin further discloses program code executed under the control of the JAVA virtual machine, but does not disclose or fairly suggest a program code corresponding to the claimed second program code, which is directly executed under the control of an operating system (OS).

In addition, according to Hardin, a program code executed under the control of VM0 and a program code executed under the control of VM1 are independent program codes that are concurrently executable. These program codes do not have the required interrelationship set forth in the independent claims, wherein one of these program codes is a calling program code that invokes the other program code. In this regard, the Applicants note that when Hardin's VM0 relinquishes its control to the MVM control, the MVM control hands over the control to another virtual machine, but VM0 is unaware of the virtual machine that takes over the control. Thus,

Hardin's description amounts to the conventional active virtual machine scheduling conducted by the MVM control.

Accordingly, the invention claimed in claims 1-2, 7-8 and 13-14 is not obvious over AAPA in view of Hardin.

Claims 4 and 10 were rejected under 35 U.S.C. §103(a) as being unpatentable over AAPA in view of Rinne et al., U.S. Patent No. 6,098,194 (Rinne). The Applicants traverse as follows.

The invention claimed in claims 4 and 10 requires a language system having the configuration discussed above, and in particular a language system that saves code information associated with the contents of the first memory area before the first program code calls the second program code.

The claimed system judges whether code information associated with the contents of the first memory area coincides with the saved code information when the execution of the second program code ends and control returns to the language system. When it is detected that while the second program code is called, the first program code normally updates the first memory area, the language system updates the saved code information based on code information associated with the contents of the updated first memory area. Rinne is cited as disclosing the saving of the code information associated with the contents of the first memory area before the first program code calls the second program code, and the judging as to whether or not code information associated with the contents of the first memory area coincides with the saved code information when the execution of the second program code ends and control returns to the language system.

However, Rinne discloses a computer employing checksum calculated over a specific storage area, wherein a newly-calculated checksum is compared to a

previously-calculated checksum to detect errors. This calculation and comparison is different from the claimed invention, however, which rules out the monitoring of the storage area as the first program code updates the storage area during the monitoring. In particular, Rinne neither discloses nor suggests that when it is detected that while the second program code is called, the first program code normally updates the first memory area, the saved code information is updated based on code information associated with contents of the updated first memory area. . .

Therefore, the invention claimed in claims 4 and 10 is not obvious over the combination of AAPA and Rinne.

The rejections of claims 5 and 11 are moot in view of the cancellation of these claims. Further, the addition of Wenocur et al., U.S. Patent Publication No. 2002/0165912 (Wenocur) in the rejection of dependent claims 3, 6, 9, 12 and 15 does not add the teachings missing from the Hardin and Rinne documents, and thus these claims are patentable as well.

In view of the foregoing amendments and remarks, applicants submit that claims 1-4, 6-10 and 12-15 are in condition for allowance. Accordingly, early allowance of claims 1-4, 6-10 and 12-15 is respectfully requested.

To the extent necessary, the applicants petition for an extension of time under 37 CFR 1.136. Please charge any shortage in fees due in connection with the filing of this paper, including extension of time fees, or credit any overpayment of fees, to

01-29-'07 16:33 FROM-Mattingly, Stanger

703-684-1157

T-239 P016/035 F-870

U.S. Application No. 10/829,205

the deposit account of MATTINGLY, STANGER, MALUR & BRUNDIDGE, P.C.,

Deposit Account No. 50-1417 (NIT-421).

Respectfully submitted,

MATTINGLY, STANGER, MALUR & BRUNDIDGE, P.C.



Daniel J. Stanger
Registration No. 32/846

DJS/sdb
(703) 684-1120